The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., MARCH 3, 1904. No. 9.

WAS FATHER HENNEPIN AN IMPOSTOR?

WE are asked: "Is it true that Father Louis Hennepin, the famous Récollet friar and explorer, was an impostor? I have repeatedly seen this statement in books, pamphlets, and newspapers, and lately a local sheet has rehashed it. What are the facts?"

Since Parkman wrote his 'Lasalle and the Discovery of the Great West,' it has been the custom to decry Father Hennepin as a liar and an impostor. The charge rests on this basis:

"Hennepin's first book was published soon after his return from his travels, and while Lasalle was still alive. In it, he relates the accomplishment of the instructions given him, without the smallest intimation that he did more.*) Fourteen years after, when La Salle was dead, he published another edition of his travels,†) in which he advanced a new and surprising pretension. Reasons connected with his personal safety, he declares, before compelled him to remain silent; but a time at length has come when the truth must be revealed. And he proceeds to affirm that, before ascending the Mississippi, he, with his two men, explored its whole course from the Illinois to the sea, thus anticipating the discovery which forms the crowning laurel of Lasalle..... The story was distrusted from the first.‡) Why had he not told it before? An excess of modesty, a lack of self-assertion, or a too sensitive reluctance to wound the susceptibilities of others, had never been found among his foibles. Yet some, perhaps, might have believed him, had he not, in the first edition of his book,

*) 'Description de la Louisiane, nouvellement decouverte,' Paris, 1683.

†) 'Nouvelle Decouverte d'un tres grand Pays situe dans l'Amerique,' Utrecht, 1697.

‡) See the preface of the Spanish translation by Don Sebastian Fernandez de Medrano, 1699, and also the letter of Gravier, dated 1710, in Shea's 'Early Voyages on the Mississippi.' Barcia, Charlevoix, Kalm, and other early writers, put a low value on Hennepin's veracity.

gratuitously and distinctly declared that he did not make the voyage in question. 'We had some designs,' he says, 'of going down the river Colbert (Mississippi) as far as its mouth; but the tribes that took us prisoners gave us no time to navigate this river both up and down.'§)"

The above quotation, with the accompanying notes, is from Parkman, 'La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West,' (Works, iii, 225, 227), who adds that Father Hennepin found himself in another "serious embarrassment" for having stated in his first book that, "on the twelfth of March, he left the mouth of the Illinois on his way northward, and that, on the eleventh of April, he was captured by the Sioux, near the mouth of the Wisconsin, five hundred miles above," which "would give him only a month to make his alleged canoe-voyage from the Illinois to the Gulf of Mexico, and again upward to the place of his capture,—a distance of three thousand two hundred and sixty miles." In trying to solve this difficulty, Hennepin "ensnares himself in a hopeless confusion of dates." (Id. ibid. 228, 229.)

Parkman also charges Hennepin with gross plagiarism (ib. 230), but concedes (ibid.) that "his local descriptions, and even his estimates of distance, are generally accurate;" that "the various Sioux words" which he uses incidentally, "and which he must have acquired by personal intercourse with the tribe," "are in every instance correct" (231), and that "till he reaches the Mississippi, there can be no doubt that in the main he tells the truth" (p. 230).

While the historians are pretty generally agreed that the books attributed to Hennepin, with the exception of his first, abound in clumsy plagiarisms, and that the new claim of priority over Lasalle was mendacious, one of our own writers, John Gilmary Shea,*) who first held to the common opinion that Hennepin was a falsifier,†) later sought to show‡) that an unscrupulous publisher made up the new editions out of such material as lay at hand, apparently without consulting the author. Shea based his "Rettung" chiefly on the circumstance that several "sections" of the 'Nouvelle Découverte' bear special "signatures" of a character indicating that the type was set up and the sheets printed in different offices.

Mr. Victor Paltsits, of the Lenox Library, in the carefully col-

---

§) Description de la Louisiane, 218.

*) Who, by the way, is charged by Mr. Victor Paltsits, in his complete Bibliographical Data in Thwaites' new edition of the 'Decouverte' (v. infra), with being "responsible for some of the worst bulls with which this subject is overburdened," blunders which "were copied, extended, and perpetuated by others, notably Winsor, Remington, and Dinne" (p. xlvi.)

†) Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley (New York, 1853) pp. 99-106,

‡) In the introduction to his translation of 'Louisiane' (1880).

lated "Bibliographical Data" accompanying Thwaites' new English edition of the 'Nouvelle Découverte,' §) takes the view that the mechanical peculiarities are not such as to warrnat the conclusion that it was printed in different offices (p. liii) and that, besides, "the author's 'Avis au Lecteur' (in the original edition of 'Nouvelle Découverte') and other considerations would seem to indicate that he supervised the work personally" (p. liv.) A careful comparison between 'Louisiane' and its successors leads Mr. Paltsits "irresistibly" to the conclusion that the blame must rest upon the shoulders of Hennepin quite as much as upon those of his publishers.

Mr. Thwaites himself winds up his scholarly account of Hennepin and his methods as follows: "The opportunities afforded this evangelist for connecting his name with an important enterprise of exploration were perhaps unexampled, save in the case of Marquette himself. His first book, as the annalist of the expedition, is that of a boaster, and nearly every incident therein is obviously overcolored.... With surprising audacity he adopts a patronizing tone towards even such men as La Salle and Du Luth, and discredits their deeds, which were far greater than his own. The successors to the volume are.... marred by inexcusable and bungling mendacity, which shows the author to have been morally unfitted for the ecclesiastical calling" (XLII.)

Hence, the status of the question may be briefly summarized thus: If Shea's theory is correct, and if it can be shown that the hand of an anonymous and treacherous editor made alterations in Hennepin's book after its first printing, with a view to make it more salable, the good name of "the hero of the upper Mississippi" may be saved. But if the latter two works are really Hennepin's, there can be no doubt that he has prevaricated.*) The greater probability seems to favor the latter alternative.

Nevertheless, "when all is said, we must acknowledge Hennepin's works to be invaluable contributions to the sources of American history; they deserve study, and to this day furnish rare entertainment. We can pardon much in our erratic friar, when he leaves to us such monuments as these."†)

Fortunately, to close with a remark of the scholarly New York *Evening Post* (Dec. 22nd, 1903), "it is not beyond the power of criticism to separate the genuine portions of the narrative from

---

§) A New Discovery of a Vast Country in America, by Father Louis Hennepin. Reprinted from the second London issue of 1698, with facsimiles of original title-pages, maps, and illustrations, and the addition of Introduction, Notes, and Index, by Reuben Gold Thwaites, Editor of The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. In two volumes. Chicago: A. C McClurg & Co. 1903.

*) Cfr. O'Gorman, A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, 3rd ed., pp. 186 and 187.

†) Thwaites, l. c., p. xlvi.

those which are written in a spirit of colossal bluff, and Hennepin's works will long retain their place among the most celebrated records of American travel," and, we may add, among the most valuable sources of our early history.

* * *

"INDULGENCE BILLS."

A short time ago Protestant papers in Germany spoke of certain discoveries alleged to have been made by Prof. A. Schulte in the Vatican archives. The following is in brief the Protestant version of the story:

"The Catholic historian, Prof. A. Schulte of Bonn, for a time director of the Prussian Historical Institute at Rome, discovered some indulgence bills in the Vatican. Although the well-known librarian Fr. Ehrle, S. J. entreated him to publish them, the Professor felt uneasy and undecided. In his doubtful anxiety he laid his difficulties before the German Chancellor, Count von Bülow, who promptly answered: 'Ignore it!'"

If we may believe the *Volkszeitung* of Cologne, both accusations, that against the Professor, in as far as it charges him with having suppressed aggravating discoveries, as well as the other against the Chancellor, are malicious inventions, based upon facts altogether harmless. Several Protestant editors seem to have accepted them all the more readily, as they were calculated to compromise Count von Bülow. The Imperial Chancellor has become a *persona ingrata* with the liberals, because he publicly promised to favor the abolition of §2 of the anti-Jesuit law.

Without entering on a defense of the Chancellor and the Professor, we would remark that their accusers presuppose in the latter more than the ordinary amount of the proverbial professorial distraction.

As soon as the story of the newly discovered but suppressed indulgence bills found its way into the Protestant papers, we naturally expected that the indulgence question of 1517 would be once more hotly discussed. It was rather disappointing, however, to find the old fable of the "sale of indulgences" revamped. To say the least, this question is no longer, or rather it was never, of any interest to the defenders of Protestantism. It was only the apparent cause of Luther's rebellion. The "reformer" himself states this in a note to Tetzel, adding: "The child has quite a different father"?*)

---

*) These and the following historical facts are taken partly from Janssen's 'History of the German People,' partly from articles of the Koelnische Volkszeitung; but principally from Paulus' article in the Berlin Germania.

Have we Catholics anything to fear from the publication of these indulgence bills?

But, first of all, what are indulgence bills? To answer this question, we must give a short summary of the famous grant of indulgences of 1517, a chapter of history which is less known to most people than its disastrous consequences.

On the occasion of their receiving the pallium the archbishops of Mayence at the close of the Middle Ages had to pay to the Roman curia a sum of not less than 20,000 Rhenish gulden. This amount, exceedingly large for that time, was collected from the faithful people of the diocese or electorate. Naturally, a bad feeling was created among these when, shortly before 1515, the tax had to be paid twice in less than ten years. The chapter of the cathedral, sympathizing with the people of the Archdiocese, therefore readily and almost unanimously elected Albrecht of Brandenburg, when this prince offered to defray the pallium duty out of his own pocket. At that time, in 1514, Leo X. renewed Pope Julius II.'s grant of a plenary indulgence for all those who would contribute to the funds necessary to complete the new cathedral of St. Peter in Rome. Albrecht knew that several German princes and cities had gotten from the Holy See indulgence bulls, by means of which they were enabled to gather money for different purposes. Why then should he empty his own purse and not rather petition the Holy Father to appoint him commissary for the papal jubilee in the northern part of the Empire, and to allow him as such, in order to repay his creditors, to hand over one-half of the net income to the Fuggers of Augsburg, from whom he had borrowed the pallium money.*) His subsequent petition was generously granted, and the Archbishop, as is well known, in 1517 delegated the famous Dominican John Tetzel to preach the indulgence.

By mutual agreement Tetzel was accompanied by a representative of the Fuggers, who traveled with him from district to district, from town to town, from hamlet to hamlet. Before leaving a place these two men, in the presence of witnesses, counted the money which the faithful had put into the "indulgence box." After deducting all expenses, the residuary amount was entered on an official record and attested by a notary public. Since the Pope had likewise entrusted his financial affairs in Germany to the banking house of the Fuggers—the Rothschilds of those days—the net amount collected was handed over to their representative, who forwarded it to the business manager at Leipsic. The latter sent one-half to Augsburg, the other half to Engelbert Schauer,

*) It seems that the Elector hardly expected to collect over 40,000 gulden.

the agent of the Fuggers in Rome, who turned it over with the necessary documents to the curia.

These accounts are the so-called "indulgence bills." Their existence was known long before modern historians found the originals in the Vatican archives. Hence their discovery and publication could no more disturb the peace of Catholics, than the knowledge of their having existed did formerly disturb them.

If Catholics had ever denied that, to gain the indulgences of 1517, a certain tax was prescribed for all those who were able to pay, we could understand why Protestant writers should look upon those bills as incriminating the Church. But since the facts have always been frankly admitted, we can but wish to see the bills published at the earliest opportunity.

Now a word on the undying accusation that the Church "sold" indulgences. It is Catholic doctrine that the Pope has the power to grant indulgences whenever he has a sufficient reason to do so. Sometimes the reason was to foster piety and devotion, sometimes, to avert calamities from the Church or Christian nations and countries, sometimes, to provide funds for public institutions or churches, hospitals, seminaries, universities, etc. For ample proof we refer the reader to the history of the Middle Ages. One thing, however, must not be overlooked. No strict proportion is required between indulgences and good works, because in granting the former the Pope may show himself liberal, even as Christ himself, while on earth, distributed his graces prodigally.

When indulgences were granted in favor of churches, schools, etc., the Pope naturally expected the faithful to contribute to these charities. According to the intention of the pontiff—as many documents prove—the money was always given for the good purpose as such. The liberality of the giver was, however, excited and awarded by the Church by granting indulgences. The difference between selling indulgences and granting them as a reward to all who would donate alms for a good purpose, may fitly be illustrated by the following example: If a fair is held for the benefit of a certain hospital, undoubtedly the people go there—exceptions only prove the rule!—to contribute to the hospital, rather than to pay for the amusement provided. Many even contribute without going to the fair at all. It is similar in our case;—not to mention that alms-giving was commonly not the only condition, a fact which clearly shows that the Church never meant to "sell" indulgences.

We readily admit that abuses occurred. Though indulgences were never "sold," the intention to collect money was at times rather too prominent. Besides, now and then indulgences were granted too freely, and this fact had no good influence on Catholics. In the particular question concerning us at present,

the agreement between pope and archbishop-elector, as explained above, was perhaps not entirely blameless, especially since the papal commissaries sometimes gave public scandal. Hieronymus Emser speaks of "greedy" commissaries, and Cardinal Sadolet does not wish to defend them. But at the same time we know that the commissaries in action in this manner acted against their instructions, which explicity insisted that they should above all exhort the faithful to receive the sacraments.

Let the "indulgence bills" be published. We are sure they will definitively destroy the legend that fabulous sums were gathered by the granting of indulgences.

Meanwhile Protestants will have to permit us to try and gain indulgences for ourselves and for our and their departed friends and relatives in purgatory, "that they may be loosed from their sins."

THE PHALLIC WORSHIP OF MASONRY.

What did the stone worship of the ancients symbolize? Our author enlightened us on page 62 of his Ritualist, when he told us that the procreative powers of man were represented by a column; he hints at it in this passage when he alludes to the statue of Hermes, which indeed lacked hands and feet, but which did not lack the symbol of manhood. The stone worship of the ancients, according to concurrent testimony on this point, was but an expression of phallic worship.

So Masonry began and so Masonry ends its "consistent system." Sun worship, fire worship, Adonis worship, stone worship—are but different expressions of phallic worship, which is itself an expression of the worship of the procreative forces of nature.

The old Kabbala, to which Masonry acknowledges itself so indebted for its doctrines, will also throw light on its "Stone of Foundation."

"The Kabbala," says our author in his Encyclopaedia, p. 389, "in that more limited acceptation, in which it is intimately connected with the symbolical science of Freemasonry, may be defined to be a system of philosophy which embraces certain mystical interpretations of Scripture, and metaphysical speculations concerning the Deity, man and spiritual beings..... Much use is made of it in the high degrees and entire Rites have been constructed on its principles. Hence it demands a place in any general work on Masonry."

Let us see what light the Kabbala will throw on the question. Having explained that the doctrine of emanations is the essential

element of the Kabbala, and having set forth the ten sephiroth or emanations from the divine being, our author continues:

"These ten Sephiroth," i. e., Crown, Wisdom, Intelligence, Mercy, Justice, Beauty, Firmness, Splendor, Foundation, Kingdom, "are collectively denominated the archetypal man, the microcosm, as the Greek philosophers called it, and each of them refers to a particular part of the body. Thus the Crown is the head; Wisdom, the brain; and Intelligence, the heart, which was deemed the seat of understanding. These three represent the intellectual; and the first triad is therefore called the Intellectual World. Mercy is the right arm and Justice the left arm, and Beauty is the chest. These three represent moral qualities; and hence the second triad is called the Moral World. Firmness is the right leg, Splendor the left leg and Foundation the privates. These three represent power and stability; and hence the third triad is called the Material World. Lastly, Kingdom is the feet, the basis on which all stand, and represents the whole archetypal man."

Comment is not needed. He who runs may read. Foundation signifies precisely what the stone worship of the ancients typified, what fire worship and sun worship typify, what the columns of Strength and Wisdom and Beauty typify, what the Master and Wardens of the lodge typify,—the indulgence of the sensual appetites of man.

And hence we can understand the final reason why persons of the male sex alone can become Masons. We can understand the reason why physical perfection is so much sought for among the brethren. No wonder that Masonry should wish to conceal its doctrines under symbols, and hide its light from the eyes of the world. Its ineffable name is ineffable, unspeakable, to us Christians and Catholics, not because deserving of reverence, but because, as the Apostle admonishes us, "such things are not to be named among us." Hence we understand what was said about the "living stone" transferred from Jesus Christ to the stone worship of Masonry; we understand the symbol of the Burning Bush—"the bush filled with fire that did not consume." They are phallic symbols, like those of the old pagan mysteries, expressive of sensual passion.

Who would imagine that the square and compasses ever found on the open Bible in a Masonic lodge, are similar tokens? Yet under the term "Talisman" in Mackey's Encyclopaedia of Masonry (p. 789) we find the following:

"We do not need a better instance of this transmutation of Gnostic talismans into Masonic symbols, by a gradual transmission through Alchemy, Rosicrucianism, and mediaeval architecture, than a plate to be found in the Azoth Philosophorum of

Basil Valentine, the Hermetic philosopher who flourished in the seventeenth century. This plate, which is Hermetic in its design, but is full of Masonic symbolism, represents a winged globe inscribed with a triangle within a square and on it reposes a dragon. On the latter stands a human figure of two hands and two heads, surrounded by the sun, the moon and five stars representing the seven planets. One of the heads is that of a male, the other of a female. The hand attached to the male part of the figure holds a compass, that to the female a square. The square and the compass thus distributed seem to me to indicate that originally a phallic meaning was attached to these symbols, as there was to the point within the circle which in this plate also appears in the center of the globe. The compass held by the male figure would represent the male generative principle, the square held by the female, the female productive principle. The subsequent interpretation given to the combined square and compass was the transmutation from the hermetic talisman to the Masonic symbol."

Thus with unvarying pertinacity do the sun and sun worship and its modification, phallic worship, dog the footsteps of our investigations, turn which way we will.

* * *

BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

Studies in Saintship. Translated from the French of Ernest Hello. With an Introduction by Virginia M. Crawford. London: Methuen & Co. 1903. Price 90 cts.

Hello's 'Physionomies de Saints' in English. The introduction bears the ear-marks of Protestantism, and, while it shows an evident intention of being fair, it is far from being an adequate estimate of Hello. Objectivity is the birth-right of the Catholic, and Hello never sold one iota of his portion. It is his chief characteristic. The objective standard, the criterion of justice, the truth, to be plain, was so clear to his mental vision that he had a grasp of men and of things equaled by very few minds of his time. It is this which makes his judgments of universal application and of lasting value. It is not surprising that a Protestant who is *ipso facto* bereft of a standard, for whom now-a-days even moral right and wrong are become relative terms, should not appreciate Hello. It does seem hard, however, that Hello should fall into unsympathetic hands, and that, if there is to be an awakening of interest in him, it should not have its origin or at least be encouraged in the right quarter. For the translations themselves, they are honest and precise. The style of Hello is extremely difficult to transfer, as

it is opposed to the genius of our tongue. Even stripped of the beauty of their native garb, these sketches have an individuality and a significance which is at once apparent. They can not be read without conveying a distinct and life-like conception of the saints of whom they treat.

——We beg to recommend to our German readers who desire a popular Catholic review of politics, religion, and literature, *Die Wahrheit*, published monthly by Dr. Armin Kausen at Munich (Kgl. Hofbuchhandlung Jos. Bernklau). As an appetizer we give the table of contents of the first *heft* for 1904: "An der Jahreswende," a conspectus of the political situation in Germany from the Catholic view-point; an essay on Denifle's 'Luther und Lutherthum,' considered in its bearing upon the religious peace of the Fatherland; an instructive though perhaps too broad-guaged lecture by a Franciscan Father on the reading of the German classics, particularly Goethe; a protest by the editor against the flood of obscenity that is lately pouring through the popular literature and over the stage of Germany; and a study on "Suicide in Cities." *Die Wahrheit* can be ordered through any Catholic book-store at the low price of 4 marks per annum, which, with foreign postage added, would make the subscription price in this country not over two dollars.

——It is gratifying to note the spirit of fairness and justice displayed in William Henry Johnson's 'Pioneer Spaniards in America' (Little, Brown & Co.), even though the author does not claim to have made original researches. Following the example set by C. F. Lummis, he metes out justice to the Spanish pioneers, and especially to the Crown of Spain in its treatment of the Indians. While condemning any wrong perpetrated upon the natives, he says (p. 32): "Let us give Spain her due. In these sketches we have seen instances enough of savage cruelty. But these were the acts of individual Spaniards. The aim of the Spanish government was to treat the Indians kindly, and, in the main, it was faithfully carried out. The whole policy of Spain was directed to fitting the Indians to share in the national life, making them part of the people."—"This point of view," observes the N. Y. *Evening Post*, Dec. 16th, "is far superior to that of sweeping vituperation characteristic of similar literature in former times, and commends the book to the sympathies of modern readers interested in the subject of Spanish-American colonization."

MINOR TOPICS.

An Episcopal Warning Against Newspaper Sensationalism.—Archbishop Bruchesi of Montreal, to whom we have more than once referred as our beau-ideal of a twentieth-century bishop, in view of the conduct of certain *soi-disant* Catholic daily newspapers published in the French language in his episcopal city, has addressed to them a most remarkable and timely letter, of which we find the full text in the *Semaine Religieuse de Montréal* (xliii, 7) and an English synopsis in the *True Witness* (liii, 33.) His Grace points out the dangers incurred by the sensational publication of all the details of crime, as they are related in public trials. He asks the Catholic press to refrain from accentuating their reports with vivid descriptions, minute details, and elaborate illustrations. While admitting that the business of a newspaper is to supply its readers with accounts of passing events and to make them acquainted with what is taking place in the world, His Grace clearly points out the danger to morals and to society in general that lurks in the revealing of horrid details and abominable facts—all the more regrettable because they are true, and he traces out for the Catholic dailies of Montreal, in regard to these matters, the following line of conduct: "Let your tone be irreproachable, let your language be always decent and respectful. Report only what is necessary, pass over the rest. Let your reports of crime be brief and summary. It is neither useful nor fitting that they should occupy the largest and best part of your space. Crime and homicide have no right to such excessive honor. Why persist in giving them the precedence over political, industrial, social, or religious events, which are much worthier of attention?" It is certainly not to a country's credit that such deeds should darken its annals, and it is no work of patriotism to herald them abroad and even magnify them.

We see from the *Semaine* that the editors to whom this letter was written have received it with due humility and have even printed it in their newspapers. This is indeed, what the *True Witness* calls it—"a hopeful sign," for it gives us reason to hope that the wise and well-meant admonition of the Archbishop will be duly heeded.

THE REVIEW believes that much good could be done in this country if our bishops would occasionally address their observations and criticisms to the daily newspapers; for though these newspapers are mostly controlled by non-Catholics, nearly all of them cater to the Catholic public and would pay some heed to episcopal advice for mere business reasons. The United States is the paradise of "yellow" journalism; but where is the Catholic bishop in this country who has dared to raise his voice publicly and officially against this terrible source of corruption?

The Catholic University of America.—THE REVIEW is not the only American Catholic journal in the English language that demands justice for all at the hands of the Catholic University of America. The *Catholic Columbian* observes (No. 3):

"If they would decide to add Dominican and Jesuit professors to its faculty, and to elect a representative German as its vice-rector, they would do effective work for its benefit. Let it be the crown of our educational system, equally favorable to all portions of the Church in the United States, and loyally supported by all."

And the *Catholic Telegraph* (No. 4): "When the University was established at Washington, its promoters did not conceal the fact that they were not in love with the teaching orders. They were going to establish a new era, independent of the old fogy ideas of the religious life. They carried out their plan, but they reckoned without their hosts. The people did not hurt themselves in sending their sons to the great American Catholic institute of learning. Then came the Encyclical, 'Testem Benevolentiae,' and it burnt a soft spot on the vast majority of the University promoters. Time went on apace, and those in control of the University began to realize that, if they did not do something heroic, the buildings, dedicated in 1889, would go into innocuous desuetude. The Rt. Rev. Rector hastened to Rome, executive sessions were held in the Eternal City, and the Pope, as a result, urged Catholic Americans to support the University.... The Catholic University ought to be assisted, but *only on the basis of real ultramontane Catholicity without any frills of so-called Americanism or hatred of the German*" (and, we may add, any other) "*element in this country.**) It will not do to antagonize the religious orders, for the people at large have a great deal of confidence in the sincerity of people under religious vows, and they know just enough of history to realize that, in the times of greatest trial, it was the religious orders that preserved the faith."

An Associated Press despatch of Jan. 28th announced that the Catholic University was about to enter upon "a liberal and broad policy." The only policy that will save it, is that indicated above by the *Telegraph*.

Religious Toleration.—Mr. Bryce, in his standard work, 'The American Commonwealth,' points out that "the absence of State interference in matters of religion is one of the most striking differences between all the European countries on the one hand, and the United States on the other";—but he also remarks that "of course if any ecclesiastical authority were to become formidable either by its wealth or by its control over the members of its body, this easy tolerance would disappear."

"Of course it would disappear," comments the *Casket* (No. 25). "Bryce writes as a statesman. He knows what the State always does when confronted by a power which seems strong enough to become a rival, no matter what the rights and public usefulness of that power may be. And his prophecy has been fulfilled. In the Philippines the American State found itself confronted by a united Church which possessed enough wealth for its purposes, and power over the people that seemed formidable. At bottom the religious difficulty is the same in the Philippines as in France. Of course there are material differences. In the Philippines the

---

*) Italics ours.—A. P.

civil power is external and foreign, and does not need the support of a majority of the people. A very swell minority suffices. But the attitude of the two governments is, in some important respects, identical. In both cases the everlasting fear of 'a State within the State' is an underlying motive. In both cases the cry is: The religious orders must go. In America as in France we see the Catholics divided and powerless owing to party interests, to the indifference of many, to blind gropings in efforts to meet an evil they feel but do not understand, to over-confidence in assurances from high quarters, and to efforts of the civil power to divide Catholic influence, honoring and humoring Catholics in some places or respects, while laying a heavy hand upon them in others."

Priest or Lay Editors, Which?—Dr. Condé B. Pallen has given us his reasons why he prefers the lay to the priest editor. Pallen is a layman. Now comes one John Francis Waters, M. A., apparently a clergyman, in the *Champlain Educator*, (Feb.), and says:

"The priest-editor is the typical editor. He is a teacher in a dual capacity, accredited both by God and man. Because he is amenable to higher power and because he is never a mere hireling, he is far less liable to make a false step than is the layman and far more likely to recover himself if he do. Because he is in relationship so intimate with the mystic Sacrifice of the New Law, he is incomparably more ready to comprehend and to act up the lesson of the Cross which is of the very essence of Christianity. Were the priest-editor omnipresent we should not have to deplore so much Catholic backsliding, so many degrading alliances with so-called religious liberalism, so much time-serving worship of the supremacy of the State."

In matter of fact, probing down to the esssence, it makes little difference if an editor be a priest or a layman. "The grace of Holy Orders does not destroy nature," says the immortal Brownson (Latter Life, page 279), because, as he explains, while "the grace of orders confers the power of performing sacerdotal functions, which the layman can not perform"; "it is no part of Catholic faith or doctrine that it increases the quality or quantity of a man's brain, or the sum of his science and learning. Some bishops are great theologians, some can hardly be called theologians at all. The same may be said of some priests." (Ib. page 281.)

A clever, well-informed, and up-to-date writer, conservative in his views and prudent in expressing them, fearless in advocating truth and justice and victorious in his defence of both, will make a good editor, whether he has received holy orders or not.

"Daughters of the Faith."—With mingled feelings we read a few weeks ago in Eastern papers of the organization of a new society for Catholic women, called "Daughters of the Faith," for the purpose of "fighting the evils of divorce, race suicide, gambling and drinking in public." We are informed by the *Catholic Telegraph* (lxxiii, 3) that several prominent members have already withdrawn from the new society:

"On the list of organizers were the names of Miss Annie Leary, the millionaire Countess of the Papal See, famous for the munifi-

cence of her charities and the splendor of her entertainments, and Mrs. Frederick Neilson, a society leader and mother of Mrs. Reginald Vanderbilt and Mrs. Hollis Hunnewell. Both these ladies withdrew their names when, against their protest, a clause putting the social ban on all divorced persons was placed in the constitution, which each member gave a pledge to support. The two society leaders number many of the most fashionable divorcees among their intimates and they were not willing to forswear their society. Miss Leary, particularly, who has for years been identified with Mrs. Astor's set, did not wish to give the countenance of her support to such sweeping views. She numbers among her friends Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont and many other notable divorcees, and could not put herself on record as forswearing their society. One of Mrs. Neilson's daughters, Mrs. Hollis Hunnewell, recently divorced Arthur I. Kemp and was remarried soon after. It was hardly likely that she would place the ban upon her own daughter."

It is evidently not from the Catholic "society women" that salvation in Israel will come.

In our next we shall have something more to say on the "Filiae Fidei."

Higher Education in this Country is becoming more and more secularized, and President Jacob J. Schurman, who is surely no advocate of a return to "the principle of denominational control of colleges and universities," which, in his opinion, has entirely "lost its hold on the men of to-day," doubtless points to the greatest danger that threatens the future of American education when he declares (*Globe-Democrat*, Dec. 27th), that there is a great "temptation on the part of modern institutions to refuse to accept" the "obligation" of training their students' character. He considers the "educational problem of the next year and the next generation" to be, "so to maintain the practical and useful, that we shall not let go of what is ideal and spiritual."

Unfortunately, the modern spirit that rules our secular colleges and universities, the spirit of Agnosticism, is destructive of spiritual culture and spiritual life. In the words of the lamented Brother Azarias, "it is a spirit that ponders and weighs and measures the mysteries of life and death, of time and eternity, with the small weights and short measurements of its own estimates, and because they are found inadequate, it finds fault, not with the weights or measures, but with the mysteries, and endeavors to ignore them." ('Phases of Thought and Criticism,' p. 72.) No chain of purely human reasoning can lead to the invisible region of the spiritual life. "It is beyond the range of human ken. There yawns a chasm between Agnosticism and Christianity that human hands can not bridge over" (ibid. 77.)

Advisability of Fire Drills in Schools.—The subjoined extract from a useful article in No. 2876 of the N. Y. *Independent* is recommended to the managers of all our schools:

There can be no fire drills in the case of theatre audiences, but the advantage of a well practiced fire drill, such as is familiar in many schools in our large cities, and ought to be familiar in all,

is illustrated by a recent fire. A three-story school house, with six hundred children, caught fire while the school was in session. Smoke was observed coming from the walls about the registers on the second floor; the teacher telephoned the principal on another floor; he made a speedy investigation and sounded the fire gong, which was the signal for a fire drill of the pupils. They responded immediately. None of the teachers or scholars was in a panic, and in less than two minutes the whole school was on the street, without their wraps. Then the larger boys went back and secured the wraps from the lower story and some of those from the second story, but the whole building was in flames, and half the children lost their outer clothing. Not a single life was lost, nor one child injured, although the building was totally destroyed. That one experience was enough to justify and repay all the trouble that had been had in fire drills during a dozen or more years.

Rev. Dr. Maignen on Houtin's Book on Americanism. — We had remarked in our criticism of the Abbé Houtin's new book on Americanism (vol. xi, No. 4, p. 52), that we could not agree with our esteemed friend Rev. Dr. Maignen, "the Martel of Americanism," in his judgment (in *La Vérité Française*, No. 3,782) that *M.* Houtin's exposé of the religious situation in the United States is substantially correct. Dr. Maignen now writes us from Tournai (Belgium), under date of February 12th: "Je dois reconnaitre la justesse de ce que vous dites au sujet de mon appreciation de ce livre. J'avais redigé un peu trop vite le passage que vous relevez. Dans ma pensée, j'approuvais seulement ce que dit Houtin de l'appoint apporté par l'immigration à l'accroissement du nombre des catholiques américains. Comme il me donnait raison contre *M.* Brunetière, je l'approuvais en cela. Mais ma parole est allé plus loin que ma pensée. Je vous serai reconnaissant de le dire."

Dr. Maignen also informs us that the S. Congregation of the Index is devoting due attention to Abbé Houtin's latest production. Our readers will remember that we concluded our critique (l. c.) with these words: "It would not surprise us if the Sacred Congregation of the Index would inscribe 'L'Américanisme,' after 'La Question Biblique' and 'Mes Difficultés avec mon Évêque' on the official roster of forbidden books."

——Instructive as to the workings of "Zion," are a set of instructions from the hand of "Elijah" Dowie to one of his travelling financial agents, to be used in directing his efforts to build up the worldly interests of the sect. A copy of these instructions recently came into the possession of a La Crosse gentleman, who gave them to the *Chronicle* of that city for publication. The most striking thing about them is that they clearly prove that the chief essential in the candidate for entrance into Zion, is that he is liberally endowed with worldly goods. The instructions comprise a list of people to be seen, data as to past experiences with them, and a summarization of their property and bank account. They may be read verbatim in the La Crosse *Chronicle* of February 21st.

——In reply to a recent enquiry from a reverend subscriber as to the existence of schools or institutions for Catholic blind children in this country, we will say that we know of but two: the one, in New York State, at Staten Island, under the charge of the Sisters of St. Francis, and the other in Jersey City, N. J., under the care of the Sisters of Peace. Both these schools are in an experimental stage and number not more than 30 to 40 (female) children. There is also a home for adults connected with the Jersey City school. Our record, therefore, is not brilliant. Two small schools, as against 44 or more State institutions (not including homes); attendance 40, as against upward of 4,500!

——For the information of several enquiring readers, and for the benefit of all others, we will say that Roman and Arabic numerals placed in brackets after the name of a newspaper or magazine indicate the volume and number from which the citation is taken. If there are two sets of Arabic figures, the second indicates the page of the periodical quoted. Thus: "*Catholic Telegraph* (lxxiii, 13, 7) would mean that the preceding quotation was taken from the seventy-third volume of the *Catholic Telegraph*, No. 13, page seven.

——Our friend and occasional contributor Dr. Fr. Ess requests us to call the attention of our readers to the fact that he has established, together with Rev. Dr. K. Miller, at Stuttgart, a "pensionat" (boarding-school) for boys and young men who attend any of the higher institutions of learning in the capital city of Würtemberg. The school also offers special courses, board and lodging to foreigners who desire to learn German. The Doctor may be addressed at 54 Stafflenbergstrasse, Stuttgart, Germany.

——At the annual dinner of the alumni of Seton Hall in New York the other day, Rector O'Connell of the Catholic University of America said, according to the *Sun* (Feb. 9th):

"The Church ought not to maintain parochial schools and preparatory schools and colleges unless it is also to maintain a university."

We wonder whether the Holy Father would approve of this strange utterance.

——The London *Tablet* [No. 3323] says of the Duke of Norfolk, who recently married again, that "there is not another man within the four seas who has such an abiding claim to the gratitude of the Catholics of England." That is a high compliment paid by the official organ of an archbishop to a plain Catholic layman.

——Rt. Rev. Bishop L. M. Fink of Leavenworth has given another proof of his deep interest in Catholic education by offering $100 to each new parish school to be established in his Diocese during 1904, provided such school have a reasonable prospect of permanency.